THE HP-VERSION ERROR ANALYSIS OF A MIXED DG METHOD FOR LINEAR ELASTICITY

XUEHAI HUANG* AND JIANGUO HUANG†

Abstract: This paper focuses on the *hp*-version error analysis of a mixed discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method for the linear elasticity problem. We first derive some error estimates for two L^2 projection operators in terms of the results in [7,13,23]. Using these estimates and following the techniques in [11], we obtain the *hp*-version error estimates for the solution of the method in energy norm and L^2 norm. Finally, we perform several numerical experiments to demonstrate the theoretical results obtained.

Keywords: Linear Elasticity, Discontinuous Galerkin Method, Mixed Method, *hp*-Version Error Analysis

MSC 2010: 74B05, 65N15, 65N30

arXiv:1608.04060v1 [math.NA] 14 Aug 2016

1. Introduction. Linear elasticity equations are frequently used to model linear deformation of elastic structures under a prescribed load, which can be expressed as a system of PDEs with respect to two fundamental mechanical quantities–displacement and stress. Mixed element methods are efficient in simultaneously approximating the displacement and stress with desired accuracy (cf. [1, 2, 4]). The main difficulty in constructing such methods is the design of a stable pair of finite element spaces approximating displacement and stress, since the stress field is symmetric and belongs to $\boldsymbol{H}(\mathrm{div}) := \{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in (L^2(\Omega))_{d\times d}; \boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d\}$. The discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method is an effective approach to resolving this by weakening the regularity of finite element spaces. As a matter of fact, there have developed many DG methods for solving linear elasticity problems. First of all, some primal discontinuous Galerkin methods are proposed for linear elasticity, including local DG method in [22] and interior penalty DG method in [19, 20]. A mixed discontinuous Galerkin method with symmetric stress tensor for linear elasticity is given in [10]. In [9], a mixed DG formulation is also designed with nonsymmetric stress tensor. Following [11,15], a general setting of constructing DG methods with symmetric stress tensor is developed in [12] for solving linear elasticity problems, among which the h-optimal convergence analysis of the related LDG method is also analyzed.

For the discontinuous DG method, the finite element function does not require to be continuous, so arbitrary degrees of polynomials can be used in individual elements of a triangulation, to increase computational efficiency by *hp* adaptivity. In this paper, we are interested in extending the method in [12] to *hp*-version and then establish the error analysis accordingly. Before doing this, let us review some representative results in *hp*-version finite element methods for second order elliptic problems. As an early and important result, the optimal error estimate in H^1 norm of the *hp*-version finite element method with triangulation containing triangles and parallel elements in two dimension is given in [7] for second order elliptic problems with smooth solutions. However, this result is suboptimal for singular solutions in some cases. We refer to [27] for an excellent historical survey about p and *hp* finite element methods before 2000. Based on the very technical theory of the Jacobi-weighted Besov spaces (cf. [5,6]), the optimal convergence of the *hp*-version finite element method with triangulation containing curvilinear triangles and quadrilaterals in two dimension is derived in [17, 18] for problems with both smooth and singular solutions.

*College of Mathematics and Information Science, Wenzhou University, Wenzhou 325035, China (xuehaihuang@wzu.edu.cn). The work of this author was supported by the NSFC Project 11301396, and Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China Projects LY14A010020, LY15A010015 and LY15A010016.

†Corresponding author. School of Mathematical Science, and MOE-LSC, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China (jghuang@sjtu.edu.cn). The work of this author was partly supported by NSFC (Grant nos. 11171219, 11571237).

Furthermore, *hp*-version error estimates are also analyzed for DG methods of second order problems in recent years (cf. [21,24]), which are optimal in the mesh size h and suboptimal in the degree of polynomial p. In [16], under the condition that the exact solution of reaction-diffusion equation belongs to an augmented Sobolev space, *hp*-optimal error estimates have been deduced for interior penalty DG method with triangulation containing elements being C^1-diffeomorphic to parallelograms. Very recently, by use of continuous interpolations of the exact solution, a class of *hp*-version DG methods on parallelograms' mesh for Poisson's equation with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition have been proved to converge optimally in the energy norm with respect to both the local element sizes and polynomial degrees in [28].

However, to the best of our knowledge, there are few results about *hp*-version mixed finite element methods for linear elasticity. An *hp*-mixed finite element space with symmetric stress tensor for the unmodified Hellinger-Reissner formulation in two space dimensions is constructed in [4], which is the first stable one using polynomial shape functions. After establishing the elasticity complex starting from the de Rham complex, Arnold-Falk-Winther element method for the modified Hellinger-Reissner formulation in three space dimensions is built in [3], whose stress tensor is nonsymmetric. Moreover, by designing projection based interpolation operators, Arnold-Falk-Winther element for linear elasticity is extended to meshes with elements of variable order in [25, 26]. We mention in passing that all the error analysis for the previous methods is discussed in the setting of *h*-version.

In this paper, we are concerned with extending our method in [12] to the *hp*-version and then developing its error analysis in more detail. We first derive some error estimates for two L^2 projection operators in terms of the results in [7, 13, 23]. Using these estimates and following the techniques in [11], we obtain the *hp*-version error estimates for the solution of our method in energy norm and L^2 norm. We also provide a series of numerical experiments to demonstrate our theoretical results.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, some notations and the mixed DG method in *hp*-version for linear elasticity are presented. The *hp*-version error analysis for the mixed DG method is given in Section 3. And in Section 4, some numerical results are included to demonstrate our theoretical convergence orders.

2. A Mixed DG Method for Linear Elasticity. Assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ $(d = 2, 3)$ is a bounded polygon or polyhedron. Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_{ij})_{d\times d}$ be the stress, $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_d)^{\mathrm{T}}$ be the displacement, and $\boldsymbol{f} = (f_1, \cdots, f_d)^{\mathrm{T}}$ be an applied body force. Denote by $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}) := (\varepsilon_{ij}(\boldsymbol{u}))_{d\times d}$ the linearized strain tensor with $\varepsilon_{ij}(\boldsymbol{u}) := (\partial u_i/\partial x_j + \partial u_j/\partial x_i)/2$, tr the trace operator, and $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot$ the divergence operator over tensor fields.

Consider the following linear elasticity problem in the stress-displacement formulation:

$$\begin{cases} \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{0} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ -\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{f} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{0} & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathscr{A}$ is the compliance tensor of fourth order defined by

$$\mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2\mu}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \frac{\lambda}{d\lambda + 2\mu}(\mathrm{tr}\boldsymbol{\sigma})\boldsymbol{\delta}\right),$$

in which $\boldsymbol{\delta} := (\delta_{ij})_{d\times d}$ is the Kronecker tensor, and positive constants λ and μ are the Lamé constants.

In this section, let us recall the mixed DG method in [12] for solving problem (2.1) in *hp*-version. For this, we first some notations frequently used later on. For any Banach space B, the subspace of symmetric tensor-valued function is denoted $(B)^s_{d\times d}$. Given a bounded domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a non-negative integer m, let $H^m(G)$ be the usual Sobolev space of functions on G. The corresponding norm and semi-norm are denoted respectively by $\|\cdot\|_{m,G}$ and $|\cdot|_{m,G}$. If G is Ω, we abbreviate them by $\|\cdot\|_m$ and $|\cdot|_m$, respectively. Let $H^m_0(G)$ be the closure of $C^\infty_0(G)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{m,G}$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a regular family of triangulations of Ω (cf. [8,14]). For each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, denote by h_K the diameter of K and by ρ_K the diameter of the biggest ball contained in K. Let $\mathcal{E}_h$ be

the union of all faces of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$ and $\mathcal{E}_h^i$ be the union of all interior faces of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$. The triangulations we consider here can have hanging nodes but have to be regular, that is, there exists a positive constant C_1 such that

$$\frac{h_K}{\rho_K} \le C_1 \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Moreover, we need to bound the ratio of the sizes of neighbor elements. To show this property, we introduce the set $\langle K, K' \rangle$ for any two elements K and K' in $\mathcal{T}_h$ as follows:

$$\langle K, K' \rangle := \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } \mathrm{meas}(\partial K \cap \partial K') = 0, \\ \text{interior of } \partial K \cap \partial K', & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus we assume that there exists a positive constant $C_2 < 1$ such that, for each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$C_2 \le \frac{h_{K'}}{h_K} \le \frac{1}{C_2} \quad \forall\ K' \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ with } \langle K, K' \rangle \neq \emptyset.$$

This assumption avoids the situation where the mesh is indefinitely refined in only one of two adjacent subdomains.

Based on the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} &:= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \left(L^2(\Omega)\right)^s_{d\times d}; \tau_{ij}|_K \in H^1(K) \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h, i, j = 1, \cdots, d \right\}, \\ \boldsymbol{V} &:= \left\{ \boldsymbol{v} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d; v_i|_K \in H^1(K) \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h, i = 1, \cdots, d \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding finite element spaces are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h &:= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \left(L^2(\Omega)\right)^s_{d\times d}; \tau_{ij}|_K \in \mathcal{S}_1(K) \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h, i, j = 1, \cdots, d \right\}, \\ \boldsymbol{V}_h &:= \left\{ \boldsymbol{v} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d; v_i|_K \in \mathcal{S}_2(K) \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h, i = 1, \cdots, d \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where, for each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $\mathcal{S}_1(K)$ and $\mathcal{S}_2(K)$ are two finite-dimensional spaces of polynomials in K containing $P_{l_K}(K)$ and $P_{k_K}(K)$, respectively. Here, k_K and l_K are two nonnegative integers, and for a nonnegative integer m, $P_m(K)$ stands for the set of all polynomials in K with the total degree no more than m. We always assume that

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{V}_h) \subset \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h, \quad \boldsymbol{\nabla}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \subset \boldsymbol{V}_h, \quad \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \subset \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nabla}_h$ is the elementwise analogue of the gradient operator $\boldsymbol{\nabla}$, i.e. $(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau})|_K := \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}|_K$ for any $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \Sigma_h$. We assume that $|k_K - l_K| \le 1$ for any $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and set

$$p_K = \min\{k_K, l_K\} + 1 \quad \forall\ K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Then we further assume that there exists a positive constant $C_3 < 1$ such that, for each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$C_3 \le \frac{p_{K'}}{p_K} \le \frac{1}{C_3} \quad \forall\ K' \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ with } \langle K, K' \rangle \neq \emptyset.$$

For a function $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $v|_K \in H^m(K)$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $\|v\|_{m,h}$ and $|v|_{m,h}$ be the usual broken H^m-type norm and semi-norm of v:

$$\|v\|_{m,h} := \Big(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|v\|^2_{m,K} \Big)^{1/2}, \quad |v|_{m,h} := \Big(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |v|^2_{m,K} \Big)^{1/2}.$$

If v is a vector-valued or tensor-valued function, the corresponding $\|\cdot\|_{m,h}$ and $|\cdot|_{m,h}$ are defined in the similar manners. For a vector or tensor $\boldsymbol{v}$, its length $|\boldsymbol{v}|$ is $(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^{1/2}$ or $(\boldsymbol{v} : \boldsymbol{v})^{1/2}$. Here the symbol : denotes the double dot product operation of tensors. Throughout this paper,

we use the notation " $\lesssim \cdots$ " to mean that "$\leq C \cdots$", where C is a generic positive constant independent of local element sizes and polynomial degrees, which may take different values at different appearances.

Let K^+ and K^- be two adjacent elements of $\mathcal{T}_h$. Let $\boldsymbol{x}$ be an arbitrary point of the set $e' = \langle K^+, K^- \rangle$, and let $\boldsymbol{n}^+$ and $\boldsymbol{n}^-$ be the corresponding outward unit normals at that point. For a vector-valued function $\boldsymbol{v}$ smooth inside each element $K^\pm$, let us denote by $\boldsymbol{v}^\pm$ the trace of $\boldsymbol{v}$ on e' from the interior of $K^\pm$. Then we define averages and jumps at $\boldsymbol{x} \in e'$ as follows:

$$\{\boldsymbol{v}\} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{v}^+ + \boldsymbol{v}^-), \quad [\boldsymbol{v}] = \boldsymbol{v}^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{n}^+ + \boldsymbol{v}^- \cdot \boldsymbol{n}^-,$$
$$\{\boldsymbol{\tau}\} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\tau}^+ + \boldsymbol{\tau}^-), \quad [\boldsymbol{\tau}] = \boldsymbol{\tau}^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{n}^+ + \boldsymbol{\tau}^- \cdot \boldsymbol{n}^-.$$

If $\boldsymbol{x}$ is on an face e lying on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, the above terms are defined by

$$\{\boldsymbol{v}\} = \boldsymbol{v}, \quad [\boldsymbol{v}] = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{n},$$
$$\{\boldsymbol{\tau}\} = \boldsymbol{\tau}, \quad [\boldsymbol{\tau}] = \boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \boldsymbol{n},$$

where $\boldsymbol{n}$ is the unit outward normal vector on $\partial\Omega$. We define a matrix-valued jump $[\![\cdot]\!]$ of a vector $\boldsymbol{v}$ as follows:

$$[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!] = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{v}^+ \otimes \boldsymbol{n}^+ + \boldsymbol{n}^+ \otimes \boldsymbol{v}^+ + \boldsymbol{v}^- \otimes \boldsymbol{n}^- + \boldsymbol{n}^- \otimes \boldsymbol{v}^-), \quad \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i,$$
$$[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!] = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{v} \otimes \boldsymbol{n} + \boldsymbol{n} \otimes \boldsymbol{v}), \quad \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in e \in \mathcal{E}_h \cap \partial\Omega,$$

where $\boldsymbol{v} \otimes \boldsymbol{n}$ denote the matrix whose (i,j)-th component is $v_i n_j$ for two vectors $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}$.

With the former notations in mind, the mixed DG method in [12] for linear elasticity problem (2.1) is to find $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h$ such that

$$a(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}) + b(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$
$$-b(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h) + c(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \boldsymbol{v}) = F(\boldsymbol{v}), \tag{2.4}$$

for all $(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h$, where

$$a(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) := \int_\Omega \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma} : \boldsymbol{\tau} dx + \int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\sigma}] \cdot [\boldsymbol{\tau}] ds,$$
$$b(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) := -\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{v}) : \boldsymbol{\tau} dx + \int_{\mathcal{E}_h} [\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!] : \{\boldsymbol{\tau}\} ds,$$
$$c(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}) := \int_{\mathcal{E}_h} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{u}]\!] : [\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!] ds, \quad F(\boldsymbol{v}) := \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} dx,$$

with $C_{11} > 0$ and $C_{22} \geq 0$. Since the error analysis of the mixed DG method (2.3)-(2.4) for $C_{22} = 0$ has been established in [12], we only discuss in this paper the case where $C_{22} > 0$ in more detail.

3. Error Analysis for The DG Method. In this section, we provide error analysis for the mixed DG method (2.3)-(2.4) in *hp*-version context, following the error analysis setting on treating the LDG method for second-order elliptic problems (cf. [11]). We first reformulate (2.3)-(2.4) as a variational problem consisting of only one equation, described as follows.

Find $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h$ such that

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}) = F(\boldsymbol{v}) \tag{3.1}$$

for all $(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h$, where

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}) := a(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) + b(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) - b(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) + c(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}).$$

In what follows, when not explicitly stated otherwise, we always assume that $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) \in \big(H^1(\Omega)\big)^s_{d\times d} \times (H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega))^d$ is the solution of the original problem (2.1).

Let $\boldsymbol{P}_h$ be L^2 projection operator from $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ onto the finite element space $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_h$ be L^2 projection operator from $\boldsymbol{V}$ onto the finite element space $\boldsymbol{V}_h$. For simplicity, we still write $\boldsymbol{P}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_h$ for $\boldsymbol{P}_h|_K$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_h|_K$.

Using some results in [7, 13, 23], we can derive error estimates for the operators $\boldsymbol{P}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_h$, frequently used later on.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let K be an element in $\mathcal{T}_h$, with $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ a regular family of triangulations of Ω. If $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \big(H^{s+1}(K)\big)^s_{d\times d}$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in H^{s+2}(K)^d$ for some nonnegative integer s, then we have*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{0,K} + \left(\frac{h_K}{l_K+1}\right)^{1/2}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{0,\partial K} \lesssim \left(\frac{h_K}{l_K+1}\right)^{r+1}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{r+1,K} \tag{3.2}$$

for $0\le r\le \min\{s,l_K\}$, and

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0,K} + \left(\frac{h_K}{k_K+1}\right)^{1/2}\|\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0,\partial K} \lesssim \left(\frac{h_K}{k_K+1}\right)^{r+1}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{r+1,K} \tag{3.3}$$

for $0\le r\le \min\{s+1,k_K\}$.

Proof. We only give the proof of (3.2), and the estimate (3.3) can be obtained in similar manners. For ease of exposition, let $\boldsymbol{P}_K$ be the restriction of the operator $\boldsymbol{P}_h$ to element K. That means, $\boldsymbol{P}_K$ denotes the L^2 projection operator from $\big(L^2(K)\big)^s_{d\times d}$ onto $(\mathcal{S}_1(K))^s_{d\times d}$. If $d=2$, it follows from the definition of $\boldsymbol{P}_K$ and Lemma 4.5 in [7] that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{0,K} = \|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_K\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{0,K} \lesssim \inf_{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}\in(P_r(K))^s_{d\times d}}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{\varsigma}\|_{0,K} \lesssim \left(\frac{h_K}{l_K+1}\right)^{r+1}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{r+1,K}.$$

If $d=3$, we can also derive the above estimate immediately by using Theorem 2.1 in [17] or the estimate (3.22) in [21] combined with the usual scaling argument and the extension argument in [7].

Let $\hat{K}$ be a reference simplex and F_K be an affine mapping from $\hat{K}$ onto K. For a function v defined over K, let $\hat{v}$ denote the pull back of v by the mapping F_K, i.e. $\hat{v} := v\circ F_K$. Then, using Theorem 1.1 in [13] or Corollary 1.2 in [23], we have by the scaling argument (cf. [8,14]) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{0,\partial K} &= \|\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_K\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{0,\partial K} \lesssim h_K^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\big\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}-\boldsymbol{P}_{\hat{K}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\big\|_{0,\partial\hat{K}}\\
&\lesssim h_K^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}}\in\big(P_r(\hat{K})\big)^s_{d\times d}}\big\|(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}-\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}})-\boldsymbol{P}_{\hat{K}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}-\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}})\big\|_{0,\partial\hat{K}}\\
&\lesssim h_K^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{l_K+1}\right)^{r+1/2}\inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}}\in\big(P_r(\hat{K})\big)^s_{d\times d}}\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}-\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}}\|_{r+1,\hat{K}}\\
&\lesssim h_K^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{l_K+1}\right)^{r+1/2}|\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}|_{r+1,\hat{K}} \lesssim \left(\frac{h_K}{l_K+1}\right)^{r+1/2}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{r+1,K}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

The following result is a basic ingredient of our error analysis.

LEMMA 3.2. *For any $(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h$, there holds the Galerkin orthogonality*

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. By the definition of A, we have

$$\begin{aligned}A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) =& \int_\Omega \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma}:\boldsymbol{\tau}dx + \int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\cdot[\boldsymbol{\tau}]ds - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}):\boldsymbol{\tau}dx\\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{E}_h} [\![\boldsymbol{u}]\!]:\{\boldsymbol{\tau}\}ds + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{v}):\boldsymbol{\sigma}dx - \int_{\mathcal{E}_h}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]:\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\}ds\\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{E}_h} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{u}]\!]:[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]ds.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\in \big(H^1(\Omega)\big)^s_{d\times d}\times (H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega))^d$ is the solution of (2.1), so both $[\![\boldsymbol{u}]\!]$ and $[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]$ vanish, and then the above quantity $A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})$ can be expressed as

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) = \int_\Omega \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma}:\boldsymbol{\tau}dx - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}):\boldsymbol{\tau}dx + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{v}):\boldsymbol{\sigma}dx - \int_{\mathcal{E}_h}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]:\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\}ds.$$

Hence, using (2.1) and integration by parts we know

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) = F(\boldsymbol{v}). \tag{3.5}$$

Combing this with (3.1) implies (3.4) readily. □

Next, we are going to derive a number of inequalities involving the approximation properties of the projection operators $\boldsymbol{P}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_h$. As a necessary part, we first introduce two seminorms that appears in a natural way in the analysis. For $(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})\in\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\times\boldsymbol{V}$, define

$$\begin{aligned}|(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A^2 =& A(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) = \int_\Omega \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\tau}:\boldsymbol{\tau}dx + \int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i}\left(C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\tau}]^2 + C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]^2\right)ds + \int_{\partial\Omega} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]^2 ds,\\ |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_B^2 =& \int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i}\left(C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\tau}]^2 + \frac{1}{C_{11}}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}\}^2 + \frac{1}{C_{22}}\{\boldsymbol{v}\}^2 + C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]^2\right)ds\\ &+ \int_{\partial\Omega}\left(\frac{1}{C_{11}}|\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2 + C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]^2\right)ds.\end{aligned}$$

And we also require to introduce two functionals K_A and K_B, by which all the error estimates we are interested in can be obtained. For $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\in(H^{s+1}(\Omega))^s_{d\times d}\times H^{s+2}(\Omega)^d$ and $(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})\in(H^{t+1}(\Omega))^s_{d\times d}\times H^{t+2}(\Omega)^d$ with $s,t\geq 0$, define

$$K_A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) = \begin{cases}\sum\limits_{i=1}^5 S_i(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}), & \text{if } (\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\neq(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}),\\ \sum\limits_{i=1,2,5} S_i(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}), & \text{if } (\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})=(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}),\end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}S_1 :=& \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{1K}+2}\left(\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K} + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u})\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K}\right)\right)^{\frac12}\\ &\left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2t_{1K}+2}\left(\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|^2_{t_{1K}+1,K} + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{v})\|^2_{t_{1K}+1,K}\right)\right)^{\frac12},\end{aligned}$$

$$S_2 := \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{22}^{\partial K}\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{1K}+1}\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{22}^{\partial K}\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2t_{1K}+1}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|^2_{t_{1K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac12},$$

$$S_3 := \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K}\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{2K}+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{2K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{1}{\widetilde{C}_{11}^{\partial K}}\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2t_{1K}+1}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|^2_{t_{1K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac12},$$

$$S_4 := \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{1}{\widetilde{C}_{11}^{\partial K}} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{1K}+1} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2t_{2K}+1} \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2_{t_{2K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$S_5 := \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{2K}+1} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{2K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2t_{2K}+1} \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2_{t_{2K}+1,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with $0 \le s_{1K} \le \min\{s, l_K\}$, $0 \le s_{2K} \le \min\{s+1, k_K\}$, $0 \le t_{1K} \le \min\{t, l_K\}$, $0 \le t_{2K} \le \min\{t+1, k_K\}$, $\widetilde{C}_{ii}^{\partial K} := \inf\{C_{ii}(\boldsymbol{x}); \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial K\}$, $C_{ii}^{\partial K} := \sup\{C_{ii}(\boldsymbol{x}); \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial K\}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Then, define K_B by

$$K_B^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{1K}+1} \left(\frac{1}{\widetilde{C}_{11}^{\partial K}} + C_{22}^{\partial K}\right) \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K}\right) + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{2K}+1} \left(C_{11}^{\partial K} + \frac{1}{\widetilde{C}_{22}^{\partial K}}\right) \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{2K}+1,K}\right).$$

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v})$ be two functions in $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \times \boldsymbol{V}$ such that $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u})|_K \in \left(H^{s+1}(K)\right)^s_{d\times d} \times H^{s+2}(K)^d$ and $(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v})|_K \in \left(H^{t+1}(K)\right)^s_{d\times d} \times H^{t+2}(K)^d$, for each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Then we have*

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{v}) \lesssim K_A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}). \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. For convenience, we set $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} := \boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} := \boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{v}} := \boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{v}$. We start by writing

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{v}) = a(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) + b(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - b(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{v}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + c(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{v}}), \tag{3.7}$$

and then bound each term on the right side separately.

According to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|a(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}})| &= \left|\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathcal{A}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} : \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} dx + \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_e C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}] \cdot [\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}] ds\right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_{0,K} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\|_{0,K} + \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i} \|\sqrt{C_{22}}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}]\|_{0,e} \|\sqrt{C_{22}}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}]\|_{0,e} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|^2_{0,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\|^2_{0,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i} \|\sqrt{C_{22}}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}]\|^2_{0,e}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}_h^i} \|\sqrt{C_{22}}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}]\|^2_{0,e}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim S_1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}) + S_2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}).
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.2), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|b(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}})| &= \left|-\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) : \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} dx + \int_{\mathcal{E}_h} [\![\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}]\!] : \{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\} ds\right| \\
&= \left|-\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_K (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \boldsymbol{P}_h(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}))) : \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} dx + \int_{\mathcal{E}_h} [\![\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}]\!] : \{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\} ds\right| \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \boldsymbol{P}_h(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u}))\|^2_{0,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\|^2_{0,K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|^2_{0,\partial K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{1}{\widetilde{C}_{11}^{\partial K}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\|^2_{0,\partial K}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim S_1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}) + S_3(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{v}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the similar arguments as above, we also have

$$|b(\boldsymbol{\xi_v},\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma})| \lesssim S_1(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) + S_4(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}),$$
$$|c(\boldsymbol{\xi_u},\boldsymbol{\xi_v})| \lesssim \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K}\|\boldsymbol{\xi_u}\|_{0,\partial K}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K}\|\boldsymbol{\xi_v}\|_{0,\partial K}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim S_5(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}).$$

Inserting the last four estimates into (3.7) gives (3.6) for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) \neq (\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})$. In the case that $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) = (\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})$, the expression (3.7) reduces to

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\tau}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{v}) = a(\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma}) + c(\boldsymbol{\xi_u},\boldsymbol{\xi_u}).$$

So we can derive (3.6) again by using the estimates for $a(\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma})$ and $c(\boldsymbol{\xi_u},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})$ just obtained. The proof is complete. □

LEMMA 3.4. *For any* $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\times\boldsymbol{V}$ *and* $(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h$,

$$A(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}) \lesssim |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u})|_B\,.$$

Proof. By setting $\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma} := \boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\xi_u} := \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|A(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})| &\le |a(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma})| + |b(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma})| + |b(\boldsymbol{\xi_u},\boldsymbol{\tau})| + |c(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})|\\ &=: T_1+T_2+T_3+T_4.\end{aligned}$$

By the inclusion property (2.2), we know $\int_K \mathscr{A}\boldsymbol{\tau} : \boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma}dx = 0$. So it follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$T_1 \le \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\tau}]^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma}]^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,|(\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})|_B\,.$$

Furthermore, since $\int_K \boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma} : \varepsilon(\boldsymbol{v})dx = 0$ by the inclusion property (2.2), we have

$$T_2 = \left|\int_{\mathcal{E}_h} [\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!] : \{\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma}\} ds\right|.$$

Then applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality again gives

$$T_2 \le \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h} \frac{1}{C_{11}}\{\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma}\}^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,|(\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})|_B\,.$$

Since $\int_K \boldsymbol{\xi_u}\cdot(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau})dx = 0$ by (2.2), we have by integration by part and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$T_3 = \left|\int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} \{\boldsymbol{\xi_u}\}\cdot[\boldsymbol{\tau}]ds\right| \le \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} C_{22}[\boldsymbol{\tau}]^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h^i} \frac{1}{C_{22}}\{\boldsymbol{\xi_u}\}^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,|(\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})|_B\,.$$

Similarly, there holds

$$T_4 = \left|\int_{\mathcal{E}_h} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!] : [\![\boldsymbol{\xi_u}]\!] ds\right| \le \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}_h} C_{11}[\![\boldsymbol{\xi_u}]\!]^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,|(\boldsymbol{\xi_\sigma},\boldsymbol{\xi_u})|_B\,.$$

Therefore, the combination of last four estimates readily implies the desired estimate. □

LEMMA 3.5. *For any* $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\times\boldsymbol{V}$ *and* $(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v}) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h$,

$$A(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}) \lesssim |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}).$$

Proof. Using the error estimates of $\boldsymbol{P}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_h$ we find

$$|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u})|_B \lesssim K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}),$$

which together with Lemma 3.4 implies

$$A(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}) \lesssim |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u})|_B \lesssim |(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})|_A\,K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}),$$

as required. ∎

In light of the above results, we are ready to bound the error of method (3.1) in the A-seminorm.

LEMMA 3.6. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\in\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\times\boldsymbol{V}$ be the solution of (2.1) and $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}_h)\in\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h$ be the solution of (3.1). Then we have*

$$|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A \lesssim K_A^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) + K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}). \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality and Lemma 3.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A &\le |(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u})|_A + |(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A\\ &\lesssim K_A^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}) + |(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A\,.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

By Galerkin orthogonality (3.4), the definition of A and Lemma 3.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}|(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A^2 &= A(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\\ &= A(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\\ &= A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u})\\ &\lesssim |(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A\,K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}).\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$|(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A \lesssim K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}). \tag{3.10}$$

Therefore, the estimate (3.8) is a direct consequence of (3.9) and (3.10). ∎

We assume that the stabilization coefficients C_{11} and C_{22} are defined as follows:

$$C_{11}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \begin{cases} \zeta\,\min\{h_{K^+}^{\alpha_1}/p_{K^+}^{\alpha_2}, h_{K^-}^{\alpha_1}/p_{K^-}^{\alpha_2}\}, & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}\in\langle K^+,K^-\rangle\,,\\ \zeta\,h_K^{\alpha_1}/p_K^{\alpha_2}, & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}\in\partial K\cap\partial\Omega\,,\end{cases}$$

$$C_{22}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \eta\,\min\{h_{K^+}^{\beta_1}/p_{K^+}^{\beta_2}, h_{K^-}^{\beta_1}/p_{K^-}^{\beta_2}\}, \qquad \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}\in\langle K^+,K^-\rangle\,,$$

with $\zeta>0,\eta>0,-1\le\alpha_1\le 0\le\beta_1\le 1,-1\le\alpha_2\le 0\le\beta_2\le 1$, independent of the mesh size. We introduce two notations as follows:

$$\hat{\mu}_i := \max\{-\alpha_i,\beta_i\},\quad \check{\mu}_i := \min\{-\alpha_i,\beta_i\}.$$

Denote by

$$h := \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K,\ \ p := \min_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} p_K,\ \ l := \min_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} l_K,\ \ k := \min_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} k_K.$$

THEOREM 3.7. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\in\big(H^1(\Omega)\big)^s_{d\times d}\times(H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega))^d$ be the solution of (2.1) and $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}_h)\in\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h$ be the solution of (3.1). Assume that for each $K\in\mathcal{T}_h$, $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})|_K\in\big(H^{s+1}(K)\big)^s_{d\times d}\times H^{s+2}(K)^d$ with integer $s\ge 0$. Then for $0\le s_{1K}\le\min\{s,l_K\}$ and $0\le s_{2K}\le\min\{s+1,k_K\}$, we have*

$$|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A^2 \lesssim \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{2\gamma_1^K} p_K^{-2\gamma_2^K}\,\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{\max\{s_{1K}+1,s_{2K}\}+1,K}, \tag{3.11}$$

with

$$\gamma_i^K := \min\{s_{1K} + (1+\check{\mu}_i)/2, s_{2K} + (1-\hat{\mu}_i)/2\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Furthermore, for $0 \le s_1 \le \min\{s, l\}$ *and* $0 \le s_2 \le \min\{s+1, k\}$*, there holds*

$$|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A \lesssim h^{\gamma_1} p^{-\gamma_2} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\max\{s_1+1, s_2\}+1},$$

with

$$\gamma_i := \min\{s_1 + (1+\check{\mu}_i)/2, s_2 + (1-\hat{\mu}_i)/2\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof. By the definition of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ given in (2.1) we easily know $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{s+1,K} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{s+2,K}$. According to this estimate and the definition of K_A we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&K_A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) = S_1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) + S_2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) + S_5(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}; \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) \\
&\le \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{1K}+2} (\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K} + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{u})\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} C_{22}^{\partial K} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{1K}+1} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|^2_{s_{1K}+1,K} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} C_{11}^{\partial K} \left(\frac{h_K}{p_K}\right)^{2s_{2K}+1} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{2K}+1,K} \\
&\le \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^{2s_{1K}+2}}{p_K^{2s_{1K}+2}} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{1K}+2,K} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^{2s_{1K}+1+\beta_1}}{p_K^{2s_{1K}+1+\beta_2}} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{1K}+2,K} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^{2s_{2K}+1+\alpha_1}}{p_K^{2s_{2K}+1+\alpha_2}} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{s_{2K}+1,K} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{2\gamma_1^K} p_K^{-2\gamma_2^K} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{\max\{s_{1K}+1, s_{2K}\}+1,K}. \qquad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, according to the definition of K_B, we have

$$K_B^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{2\gamma_1^K} p_K^{-2\gamma_2^K} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{\max\{s_{1K}+1, s_{2K}\}+1,K}. \qquad (3.13)$$

Therefore, (3.11) follows from Lemma 3.6, (3.12) and (3.13). ∎

THEOREM 3.8. *Suppose that* Ω *is a convex bounded polygon or polyhedron. Let* $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u}) \in \left(H^1(\Omega)\right)^s_{d\times d} \times (H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))^d$ *be the solution of* (2.1) *and* $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h) \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h$ *be the solution of* (3.1)*. Assume that for each* $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$*,* $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{u})|_K \in \left(H^{s+1}(K)\right)^s_{d\times d} \times H^{s+2}(K)^d$ *with integer* $s \ge 0$*. Then for* $0 \le s_{1K} \le \min\{s, l_K\}$ *and* $0 \le s_{2K} \le \min\{s+1, k_K\}$*, we have*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0^2 \lesssim \left(\max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{2\gamma_3^K} p_K^{-2\gamma_4^K}\right) \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{2\gamma_1^K} p_K^{-2\gamma_2^K} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{\max\{s_{1K}+1, s_{2K}\}+1,K},$$

with

$$\gamma_{2+i}^K := \min\{(1+\check{\mu}_i)/2, \min\{1, k_K\} + (1-\hat{\mu}_i)/2\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Furthermore, for $0 \le s_1 \le \min\{s, l\}$ *and* $0 \le s_2 \le \min\{s+1, k\}$*, there holds*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0 \lesssim h^{\gamma_1+\gamma_3} p^{-(\gamma_2+\gamma_4)} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\max\{s_1+1, s_2\}+1},$$

with

$$\gamma_{2+i} := \min\{(1+\check{\mu}_i)/2, \min\{1, k\} + (1-\hat{\mu}_i)/2\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof. We proceed by the usual duality argument. Let $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})$ be the solution of the auxiliary problem:

$$\begin{cases} \mathscr{A}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}) = \boldsymbol{0} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ -\boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{0} & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \qquad (3.14)$$

Formally, (3.14) is problem (2.1) with $\boldsymbol{f}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h$. Applying the similar argument for deriving (3.5), we can see that

$$A(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}};\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})=\int_\Omega(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\cdot\boldsymbol{v}dx\quad\forall\ (\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})\in\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h.$$

Now taking $(\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{v})=(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)$, we have by the definition of A and Galerkin Orthogonality (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0^2=&A(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}};\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)=A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\\=&A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;\boldsymbol{P}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\\=&A(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;\boldsymbol{P}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\\&+A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{P}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}).\end{aligned}\tag{3.15}$$

Since $(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\in\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h$, we have by Lemma 3.5 and inequality (3.10) that

$$A(\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h;\boldsymbol{P}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\lesssim K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})K_B(-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}).\tag{3.16}$$

And according to Lemma 3.3, we have

$$A(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{P}_h\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{P}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{Q}_h\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\lesssim K_A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}).\tag{3.17}$$

The combination of (3.15)-(3.17) thus gives

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0^2\lesssim K_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})K_B(-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})+K_A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}).\tag{3.18}$$

By taking $s=0$ in (3.13), we obtain

$$K_B(-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\lesssim\left(\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_K^{\gamma_3^K}p_K^{-\gamma_4^K}\right)\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\lesssim\left(\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_K^{\gamma_3^K}p_K^{-\gamma_4^K}\right)\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0,\tag{3.19}$$

where we have used the following regularity estimate for problem (3.14): $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\lesssim\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$.

Using the similar argument for deriving (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&K_A(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u};-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})\\\lesssim&\left(\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_K^{\gamma_3^K}p_K^{-\gamma_4^K}\right)\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0\sqrt{\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_K^{2\gamma_1^K}p_K^{-2\gamma_2^K}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{\max\{s_{1K}+1,s_{2K}\}+1,K}}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

Finally, we can finish the proof by combining (3.18), (3.19), (3.20) and (3.13). □

At the end of this section, we will show some theoretical results for the most remarkable cases where $s_1=\min\{s,l\}$ and $s_2=\min\{s+1,k\}$ in Theorems 3.7-3.8. Table 3.1 lists the convergence orders in h/p for some special cases when $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\in\left(H^{s+1}(\Omega)\right)^s_{d\times d}\times H^{s+2}(\Omega)^d$.

C_{11}	C_{22}	$\lvert(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\rvert_A$	$\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$
$O(p/h)$	$O(1)$	$\min\{s+1/2,l+1/2,k\}$	$\min\{s+1/2,l+1/2,k\}+\min\{1/2,k\}$
$O(p/h)$	$O(h/p)$	$\min\{s+1,l+1,k\}$	$\min\{s+1,l+1,k\}+\min\{1,k\}$
$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$\min\{s,l,k\}+1/2$	$\min\{s,l,k\}+1$
$O(1)$	$O(h/p)$	$\min\{s+1/2,l+1/2,k\}$	$\min\{s+1/2,l+1/2,k\}+\min\{1/2,k\}$

Table 3.1: Convergence orders in h/p of some remarkable cases when $(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{u})\in\left(H^{s+1}(\Omega)\right)^s_{d\times d}\times H^{s+2}(\Omega)^d$, $s\geq 0$.

4. Numerical Results. In this section, we present several numerical results. Let $\Omega = (-1,1)\times(-1,1)$, $\lambda = 0.3, \mu = 0.35$ and

$$\boldsymbol{f}(x_1,x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} -8(x_1+x_2)\big((3x_1x_2-2)(x_1^2+x_2^2)+5(x_1x_2-1)^2-2x_1^2x_2^2\big) \\ -8(x_1-x_2)\big((3x_1x_2+2)(x_1^2+x_2^2)-5(x_1x_2+1)^2+2x_1^2x_2^2\big) \end{pmatrix}.$$

After a direct computation we can find that the exact solution of (2.1) is

$$\boldsymbol{u}(x_1,x_2) = \frac{80}{7}\begin{pmatrix} -x_2(1-x_2^2)(1-x_1^2)^2 \\ x_1(1-x_1^2)(1-x_2^2)^2 \end{pmatrix} - 4\begin{pmatrix} x_1(1-x_1^2)(1-x_2^2)^2 \\ x_2(1-x_2^2)(1-x_1^2)^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We partition Ω using a uniform triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$. For any $K\in\mathcal{T}_h$, we take $\mathcal{S}_1(K) = P_l(K)$ and $\mathcal{S}_2(K) = P_k(K)$ where k,l are two nonnegative integers. Set $\eta = 1$ when $C_{22}\neq 0$, and let $\zeta = 1$.

First of all, we consider the h-version convergence of our DG method with fixed p. We choose $\alpha_2 = \beta_2 = 0$. Tables 4.1-4.2 and Figures 4.1-4.2 show the errors in L^2 norm and energy norm for $k=1, l=1$ respectively, from which we may see that $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0 = O(h^2)$ for different choices of C_{11} and C_{22}, and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A = O(h)$ for $C_{22} = O(h), 0$ and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A = O(h^{3/2})$ for $C_{22} = O(1)$. Thus, the numerical convergence rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ coincide with the theoretical results in Theorem 3.8 except the cases $C_{11} = O(h^{-1}), C_{22} = O(1)$ and $C_{11} = O(1), C_{22} = O(h)$, in which the numerical convergence rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ are 1/2 higher than the theoretical convergence rates. The numerical convergence rates of $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ also coincide with the theoretical results in Theorem 3.7 except the cases $C_{11} = O(h^{-1}), C_{22} = O(1)$, in which the numerical convergence rate of $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ is 1/2 higher than the theoretical convergence rate. Moreover, numerical results for $k=1, l=0$ are given in Tables 4.3-4.4 and Figures 4.3-4.4. It is observed that numerical convergence rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ are all consistent with the theoretical results except $C_{11} = O(1), C_{22} = O(h)$ whose numerical convergence rates are better. Furthermore, we test our DG method for $k=0, l=0$ and present the numerical results in Tables 4.5-4.6 and Figures 4.5-4.6. Again the numerical convergence rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ agree with the theoretical convergence rates in Table 3.1 except the cases $C_{11} = O(1), C_{22} = O(h)$, in which both the numerical convergence rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ are 1/2 higher than the theoretical results.

h \ C_{11}, C_{22}	$O(h^{-1}), 0$	$O(h^{-1}), O(1)$	$O(h^{-1}), O(h)$	$O(1), O(1)$	$O(1), O(h)$
1	2.7907E+00	3.7355E+00	3.9650E+00	3.7263E+00	3.9531E+00
2^{-1}	1.0974E+00	9.8826E−01	9.2265E−01	1.1226E+00	1.0130E+00
2^{-2}	3.8060E−01	2.4488E−01	2.2904E−01	2.8496E−01	2.4339E−01
2^{-3}	1.1402E−01	6.0548E−02	5.7465E−02	7.0305E−02	5.7844E−02
2^{-4}	3.0809E−02	1.5001E−02	1.4395E−02	1.7475E−02	1.3818E−02
2^{-5}	7.9521E−03	3.7250E−03	3.6014E−03	4.3787E−03	3.3506E−03
2^{-6}	2.0155E−03	9.2743E−04	9.0061E−04	1.1009E−03	8.2381E−04

Table 4.1: Error $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ vs h for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k=1, l=1$.

Next, let us demonstrate the p-version convergence of our DG method with fixed h. We take $\alpha_1 = \beta_1 = 0$, $h = 1/8$, and let $l = k$. The errors $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ for $C_{11} = O(p)$, $C_{22} = O(1)$, $C_{11} = O(p)$, $C_{22} = O(1/p)$, $C_{11} = O(1)$, $C_{22} = O(1)$, and $C_{11} = O(1)$, $C_{22} = O(1/p)$ are listed in Table 4.7-Table 4.10, respectively. Similar to the observation for h-version numerical convergence, we also find that $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0 = O(1/p^{k+1})$ for different choices of C_{11} and C_{22}, and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A = O(1/p^k)$ for $C_{22} = O(1/p)$ and $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A = O(1/p^{k+0.5})$ for $C_{22} = O(1)$. Thus, the numerical convergence rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ coincide with the theoretical results in Theorem 3.8 except the cases $C_{11} = O(p), C_{22} = O(1)$ and $C_{11} = O(1), C_{22} = O(1/p)$, in which the numerical convergence

h \ C_{11}, C_{22}	$O(h^{-1}), 0$	$O(h^{-1}), O(1)$	$O(h^{-1}), O(h)$	$O(1), O(1)$	$O(1), O(h)$
1	9.0987E+00	1.2493E+01	1.2836E+01	1.2471E+01	1.2812E+01
2^{-1}	5.3420E+00	4.8502E+00	4.8539E+00	4.9027E+00	4.7674E+00
2^{-2}	3.2250E+00	1.6528E+00	2.0256E+00	1.7202E+00	1.8064E+00
2^{-3}	1.7963E+00	5.4964E−01	9.3573E−01	5.9770E−01	7.4950E−01
2^{-4}	9.4376E−01	1.8558E−01	4.5545E−01	2.1027E−01	3.3427E−01
2^{-5}	4.8247E−01	6.3630E−02	2.2579E−01	7.4592E−02	1.5596E−01
2^{-6}	2.4373E−01	2.2080E−02	1.1257E−01	2.6544E−02	7.4944E−02

Table 4.2: Error $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ vs h for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 1$.

h \ C_{11}, C_{22}	$O(h^{-1}), 0$	$O(h^{-1}), O(1)$	$O(h^{-1}), O(h)$	$O(1), O(1)$	$O(1), O(h)$
1	6.3925E+00	1.0176E+01	1.0635E+01	9.9955E+00	1.0468E+01
2^{-1}	2.1140E+00	6.2118E+00	4.0434E+00	7.5757E+00	5.6379E+00
2^{-2}	4.9023E−01	3.6613E+00	1.1967E+00	4.3381E+00	2.2842E+00
2^{-3}	1.0629E−01	2.0404E+00	3.2071E−01	2.3415E+00	8.9488E−01
2^{-4}	2.3212E−02	1.1004E+00	8.2405E−02	1.2363E+00	3.5130E−01
2^{-5}	5.2841E−03	5.7790E−01	2.0823E−02	6.4134E−01	1.4024E−01
2^{-6}	1.2504E−03	2.9754E−01	5.2292E−03	3.2802E−01	5.8102E−02

Table 4.3: Error $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ vs h for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 0$.

h \ C_{11}, C_{22}	$O(h^{-1}), 0$	$O(h^{-1}), O(1)$	$O(h^{-1}), O(h)$	$O(1), O(1)$	$O(1), O(h)$
1	1.9375E+01	2.5339E+01	2.5783E+01	2.5230E+01	2.5681E+01
2^{-1}	1.1418E+01	1.8456E+01	1.5920E+01	1.9899E+01	1.7428E+01
2^{-2}	5.6459E+00	1.3170E+01	8.5682E+00	1.4264E+01	1.0055E+01
2^{-3}	2.7144E+00	9.5205E+00	4.4004E+00	1.0175E+01	5.6226E+00
2^{-4}	1.3113E+00	6.8917E+00	2.2215E+00	7.2687E+00	3.1670E+00
2^{-5}	6.4119E−01	4.9574E+00	1.1147E+00	5.1831E+00	1.8415E+00
2^{-6}	3.1657E−01	3.5426E+00	5.5814E−01	3.6854E+00	1.1235E+00

Table 4.4: Error $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ vs h for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 0$.

h \ C_{11}, C_{22}	$O(h^{-1}), 0$	$O(h^{-1}), O(1)$	$O(h^{-1}), O(h)$	$O(1), O(1)$	$O(1), O(h)$
1	4.1084E+00	5.8643E+00	6.0867E+00	5.2390E+00	5.4575E+00
2^{-1}	3.1212E+00	3.1782E+00	3.0151E+00	4.5372E+00	3.7891E+00
2^{-2}	2.9507E+00	2.4644E+00	2.6930E+00	3.0346E+00	1.9067E+00
2^{-3}	2.9796E+00	2.6170E+00	2.8852E+00	1.7554E+00	9.1402E−01
2^{-4}	3.0255E+00	2.8213E+00	2.9964E+00	9.4401E−01	4.7760E−01
2^{-5}	3.0553E+00	2.9481E+00	3.0460E+00	4.9068E−01	2.5513E−01
2^{-6}	3.0717E+00	3.0169E+00	3.0684E+00	2.5064E−01	1.3345E−01

Table 4.5: Error $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ vs h for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 0, l = 0$.



Fig. 4.1: Error $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ vs $1/h$ in ln-ln scale for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 1$.

h \ C_{11}, C_{22}	$O(h^{-1}), 0$	$O(h^{-1}), O(1)$	$O(h^{-1}), O(h)$	$O(1), O(1)$	$O(1), O(h)$
1	1.4858E+01	1.9821E+01	2.0202E+01	1.9383E+01	1.9761E+01
2^{-1}	1.1910E+01	1.6989E+01	1.5638E+01	1.8133E+01	1.6306E+01
2^{-2}	1.0314E+01	1.4139E+01	1.1905E+01	1.4434E+01	1.0633E+01
2^{-3}	9.8875E+00	1.2325E+01	1.0373E+01	1.0780E+01	6.5685E+00
2^{-4}	9.8475E+00	1.1261E+01	9.9699E+00	7.8341E+00	4.1821E+00
2^{-5}	9.8769E+00	1.0655E+01	9.9039E+00	5.6192E+00	2.7813E+00
2^{-6}	9.9041E+00	1.0319E+01	9.9087E+00	4.0031E+00	1.9054E+00

Table 4.6: Error $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ vs h for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 0, l = 0$.

rates of $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ are $1/2$ higher than the theoretical convergence rates. The numerical convergence rates of $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ also coincide with the theoretical results in Theorem 3.7 except the cases $C_{11} = O(p), C_{22} = O(1)$, in which the numerical convergence rate of $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ is $1/2$ higher than the theoretical convergence rate.

k	$p^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$	$p^{k+0.5}\,\|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\|_A$
1	0.2812	1.6906
2	0.0704	0.5717
3	0.0227	0.1782
4	0.0085	0.0730
5	0.0107	0.1352

Table 4.7: Errors vs $1/p$ when $C_{11} = O(p), C_{22} = O(1)$ and $l = k$.



Fig. 4.2: Error $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ vs $1/h$ in ln-ln scale for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 1$.

k	$p^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$	$p^k \left\|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\right\|_A$
1	0.2812	1.1954
2	0.0620	0.3244
3	0.0202	0.0984
4	0.0077	0.0376
5	0.0086	0.0522

Table 4.8: Errors vs $1/p$ when $C_{11} = O(p), C_{22} = O(1/p)$ and $l = k$.

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank Prof. J. M. Melenk from Technische Universität at Wien, Austria for sending the first version of the manuscript [23], which is helpful for the study developed in this manuscript.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Adams and B. Cockburn, A mixed finite element method for elasticity in three dimensions, *J. Sci. Comput.*, **25** (2005), no. 3, pp. 515–521.

[2] D. N. Arnold, J. Douglas, Jr., and C. P. Gupta, A family of higher order mixed finite element methods for plane elasticity, *Numer. Math.*, **45** (1984), no. 1, pp. 1–22.

[3] D. N. Arnold, R. S. Falk, and R. Winther, Mixed finite element methods for linear elasticity with weakly imposed symmetry, *Math. Comp.*, **76** (2007), no. 260, pp. 1699–1723.

[4] D. N. Arnold and R. Winther, Mixed finite elements for elasticity, *Numer. Math.*, **92** (2002), no. 3, pp. 401–419.

[5] I. Babuška and B. Guo, Direct and inverse approximation theorems for the p-version of the finite element method in the framework of weighted Besov spaces. I. Approximability of functions in the weighted Besov spaces, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **39** (2001/02), no. 5, pp. 1512–1538.

[6] I. Babuška and B. Guo, Direct and inverse approximation theorems for the p-version of the finite element method in the framework of weighted Besov spaces. II. Optimal rate of convergence of the p-version finite element solutions, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, **12** (2002), no. 5, pp. 689–719.

[7] I. Babuška and M. Suri, The h-p version of the finite element method with quasi-uniform meshes, *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, **21** (1987), no. 2, pp. 199–238.



Fig. 4.3: Error $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ vs $1/h$ in ln-ln scale for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 0$.

k	$p^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$	$p^{k+0.5}\left\|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\right\|_A$
1	0.2812	1.6906
2	0.0794	0.5119
3	0.0260	0.1594
4	0.0092	0.0532
5	0.0125	0.1449

Table 4.9: Errors vs $1/p$ when $C_{11} = O(1), C_{22} = O(1)$ and $l = k$.

[8] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, 3rd edn., Springer, New York, 2008.

[9] R. Bustinza, A note on the local discontinuous Galerkin method for linear problems in elasticity, *Sci. Ser. A Math. Sci. (N.S.)*, **13** (2006), pp. 72–83.

[10] Z. Cai and X. Ye, A mixed nonconforming finite element for linear elasticity, *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, **21** (2005), no. 6, pp. 1043–1051.

[11] P. Castillo, B. Cockburn, I. Perugia, and D. Schötzau, An a priori error analysis of the local discontinuous Galerkin method for elliptic problems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **38** (2000), no. 5, pp. 1676–1706.

[12] Y. Chen, J. Huang, X. Huang, and Y. Xu, On the local discontinuous Galerkin method for linear elasticity, *Math. Probl. Eng.* (2010), pp. Art. ID 759547, 20.

[13] A. Chernov, Optimal convergence estimates for the trace of the polynomial L^2-projection operator on a simplex, *Math. Comp.*, **81** (2012), no. 278, pp. 765–787.

[14] P. G. Ciarlet, *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1978.

[15] B. Cockburn, Discontinuous Galerkin methods, *ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, **83** (2003), no. 11, pp. 731–754.

[16] E. H. Georgoulis and E. Süli, Optimal error estimates for the *hp*-version interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin finite element method, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, **25** (2005), no. 1, pp. 205–220.

[17] B. Guo and I. Babuška, Local Jacobi operators and applications to the *p*-version of finite element method in two dimensions, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **48** (2010), no. 1, pp. 147–163.

[18] B. Guo and W. Sun, The optimal convergence of the *h-p* version of the finite element method with quasi-uniform meshes, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **45** (2007), no. 2, pp. 698–730.

[19] P. Hansbo and M. G. Larson, Discontinuous Galerkin methods for incompressible and nearly incompressible elasticity by Nitsche's method, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, **191** (2002), no. 17-18,



Fig. 4.4: Error $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ vs $1/h$ in ln-ln scale for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 1, l = 0$.

k	$p^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$	$p^k \|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\|_A$
1	0.2812	1.1954
2	0.0659	0.2800
3	0.0210	0.0811
4	0.0077	0.0266
5	0.0098	0.0552

Table 4.10: Errors vs $1/p$ when $C_{11} = O(1), C_{22} = O(1/p)$ and $l = k$.

pp. 1895–1908.

[20] P. Hansbo and M. G. Larson, Discontinuous Galerkin and the Crouzeix-Raviart element: application to elasticity, *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, **37** (2003), no. 1, pp. 63–72.

[21] P. Houston, C. Schwab, and E. Süli, Discontinuous *hp*-finite element methods for advection-diffusion-reaction problems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **39** (2002), no. 6, pp. 2133–2163.

[22] A. Lew, P. Neff, D. Sulsky, and M. Ortiz, Optimal BV estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin method for linear elasticity, *AMRX Appl. Math. Res. Express*, (2004), no. 3, pp. 73–106.

[23] J. M. Melenk and T. Wurzer, On the stability of the boundary trace of the polynomial L^2-projection on triangles and tetrahedra, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, **67** (2014), no. 4, pp. 944–965.

[24] I. Perugia and D. Schötzau, An *hp*-analysis of the local discontinuous Galerkin method for diffusion problems, in: *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Spectral and High Order Methods (ICOSAHOM-01) (Uppsala)*, vol. 17, 2002, pp. 561–571.

[25] W. Qiu and L. Demkowicz, Mixed *hp*-finite element method for linear elasticity with weakly imposed symmetry, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, **198** (2009), no. 47-48, pp. 3682–3701.

[26] W. Qiu and L. Demkowicz, Mixed *hp*-finite element method for linear elasticity with weakly imposed symmetry: stability analysis, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **49** (2011), no. 2, pp. 619–641.

[27] C. Schwab, *p- and hp-finite element methods*, Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

[28] B. Stamm and T. P. Wihler, *hp*-optimal discontinuous galerkin methods for linear elliptic problems, *Math. Comp.*, **79** (2010), no. 272, pp. 2117–2133.



Fig. 4.5: Error $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_0$ vs $1/h$ in ln-ln scale for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 0, l = 0$.



Fig. 4.6: Error $|(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)|_A$ vs $1/h$ in ln-ln scale for different choices of C_{11}, C_{22} when $k = 0, l = 0$.